

AGENDA: August 6, 2002

7.1

CATEGORY: Unfinished Business

DEPT.: Public Works

TITLE: Senior Center/Community Center—
Refinement of Project Concepts

RECOMMENDATION

Approve the recommended actions regarding Senior Center and Community Center projects as outlined in Attachment A of the staff report.

FISCAL IMPACT

In the near term, sufficient funds are budgeted in existing capital projects to implement the recommended actions. In the longer term, additional funds will be required to construct a new Senior Center and the recommended actions authorize staff to develop a financing strategy for that project.

The adopted Five-Year Capital Improvement Program (CIP) Project 02-23, Senior Center, has a budget of approximately \$3 million. Either a five-year off-site building lease or a two-year modular lease can be funded from this account as well as a substantial portion of the design services as shown in Recommendation No. 4.

The new Community Center, Project 00-16, is fully funded in the 2002-03 Capital Improvement Program in the amount of \$15.5 million.

BACKGROUND AND ANALYSIS

This report identifies actions required to enable staff to proceed with priority capital projects, including the Senior Center, the Senior Center Master Plan, the proposed child-care center and the new Community Center. These projects and their associated policy issues have been addressed by the City Council in previous Council meetings and study sessions, by the City Council Senior Center/Community Center Ad Hoc Committee, the Parks and Recreation Commission and the community at large in public meetings on the various projects.

Most recently, the City Council met in study session on the Senior Center and Community Center projects on July 22, 2002 (Attachment B). At the meeting, the Council reviewed and discussed many policy considerations related to both projects. Based on the direction on July 22, staff is advancing the following implementation strategies for City Council action.

SENIOR CENTER

Interim Facility

At the study session, staff reviewed the seismic condition of the Senior Center and described the importance of expeditiously moving the senior programs to safe temporary quarters. The City Council reviewed two options for an interim Senior Center. The first option would construct a temporary modular facility on the site of the Senior Center, occupy them for about two years until the new Community Center is built and relocate senior programs to the Community Center while the new Senior Center is under construction. The second option would move the seniors to an off-site leased building until a new Senior Center is completed (about summer 2007). Both interim scenarios included purchasing or leasing a modular commercial kitchen at a cost of approximately \$150,000 to lease and \$200,000 to buy so that the senior nutrition program can continue. A list of the pros and cons of each alternative is shown in Attachment C and was presented to the Council at the study session.

Although both options are viable, Council comments at the study session indicated a preference for a leased off site facility over the on-site modulars. Council noted with an off-site facility the senior programs would move once whereas with the temporary modulars, programs would move a second time to the new Community Center to clear the Senior Center site before construction. Councilmembers also noted relocating senior programs to the new Community Center could impact both senior and recreational programs. Council felt a leased building could offer additional flexibility for recreational programs when seniors do not use the building.

With the Council interest in locating the seniors in an off-site permanent structure, staff obtained additional information about lease cost and tenant improvements at the most promising building located on East Middlefield Road (see Attachment D) near the light rail station in an ML Zone (limited industrial). Staff also preliminarily evaluated whether or not the site can physically accommodate senior/recreation programs. A preliminary floor plan was prepared and reviewed by Community Services Department staff. They felt the building could work for the interim Senior Center with some modifications (included in the tenant improvements), although the building does not have a commercial kitchen or a garden. The site also has only about 75 parking spaces, 25 less than the Senior Center, and is served by one local bus route. Facilities staff reviewed the major building components and concluded that with some upgrades the systems will be in reasonable condition.

The Community Development Department also reviewed the location and preliminary floor plans. A conditional use permit would be required from the Zoning Administrator under Section 36.19.3(e) of the Municipal Code, Lodges, Private Clubs and Public Halls.

Anticipated costs for a five-year lease are slightly under \$1,600,000, including an allowance of \$20 per square foot for tenant improvements. The first year per square foot cost is \$1.25, with

cost increases averaging \$0.035 each year over the five years. By comparison, the rental cost of the temporary modular facility at the Senior Center would be slightly under \$1,000,000 for a two-year term. Both require acquisition of the mobile kitchen. Although the total cost of the modulares is less, the per year cost of the building lease is less as shown below.

COST COMPARISON

	<u>Cost</u>	<u>Duration</u>	<u>Cost/Year</u>
Modulars ⁽¹⁾	\$1,000,000	2 Years	\$500,000
Building Lease ⁽¹⁾⁽²⁾	\$1,800,000	5 Years	\$360,000

⁽¹⁾ Mobile kitchen at \$150,000 to lease for modular use and \$200,000 to purchase for building lease.

⁽²⁾ Includes tenant improvements of \$20 per square foot.

Finally, at the Council study session, questions were asked about the Community Services Department plans to relocate Community Center programs during construction and how the department was working to accommodate adult education programs. Responses to these questions are in Attachment E.

To update the Senior Center program participants on the status of the interim plans and the master plan, staff met with them on Tuesday, July 30, 2002. Over 30 people attended and a summary of comments is shown in Attachment F. On the issue of a building lease versus a modular facility, the seniors appeared to be equally split with no clear preference for either alternative.

Throughout the many discussions about the Senior Center, Council has expressed strong interest in moving as quickly as possible to design and construct a new facility. At the recent study session, staff presented a time line illustrating that if the master plan is completed in October this year and design begins shortly thereafter, a new Senior Center could be built by summer 2007 if funding is identified. Staff believes the funds available in CIP Project 02-23 are adequate to accomplish most, if not all, of the Senior Center design and recommends beginning the process as soon as possible.

Financing Plan

Financing the estimated \$15 million cost of a new Senior Center is a challenge in the current economic climate. Staff is reasonably optimistic funds can be in place prior to the start of construction in early 2006, and staff recommends authorizing the development of a funding strategy for the new Senior Center. Although a variety of ideas are under consideration, the strategy will likely call for accumulating funds over several years, similar to the Community

Center approach, and may include prioritizing discretionary capital funds, deferring some projects and seeking grants.

SENIOR CENTER MASTER PLAN

The Council also discussed various master plan options developed to date. Staff explained the master plan options resulted in the site being very constrained by all the elements under consideration, including child-care, senior day health care, an intergenerational facility, a minipark and a driveway connecting the Community and Senior Centers. Many seniors were not in favor of the child-care and intergenerational facility on the Senior Center site.

The Council discussed the site constraints at the study session and concurred with deleting the minipark from the master plan. Since the site is too small to successfully accommodate a Senior Center and intergenerational facility, most Councilmembers indicated a preference to proceed with a child-care facility near the tennis courts and to see if senior day health care and space for possible intergenerational programs could be accommodated on the Senior Center site. Discussion of eliminating the driveway connecting the two centers was mixed, but the opportunity for shared parking between the facilities seemed important. Space for the driveway so it could be added in the future will also be pursued.

New Design Concepts

Attached are three new design concepts for the Senior Center master plan, see Attachments G, H and I. The new concepts are based on input from the Senior Center users, Parks and Recreation Commission, public meetings and the Council. The designs all include the following elements:

- Senior Center building.
- A garden.
- Expansion space potentially for senior day health care, and a teen component or intergenerational programming space.
- A maximum 7,000 square foot child-care facility within Rengstorff Park near the tennis courts.
- Possible future driveway connecting the Community Center and the Senior Center for shared parking potential.

The first two options show the Senior Center placed toward the front of the parcel at Escuela Avenue while the third option shows the Senior Center building at the rear of the parcel.

Option A emphasizes the diagonal pedestrian axis established at Rengstorff Park and continues it through the Senior Center parcel, and includes a large garden and outdoor space. Option B pushes the building as close to Escuela Avenue as possible and maximizes the on-site parking. Option C provides the closest connection to the childcare area and includes a possible separate entrance for an intergenerational area. Based on Council's comments and selection of Option A, B or C, staff will refine the option and return to Council for approval and further development this fall.

Child Care

The recommended location for the child-care facility is near the tennis courts in the middle of the master plan area due to the limited space available on the Senior Center parcel. An implementation plan will be required prior to any initiatives to move forward with project development leading to design and construction. The plan will address project scheduling, consultant assistance, building ownership, budget and funding strategies.

NEW COMMUNITY CENTER

As discussed at the study session, the schematic design for the new Community Center is complete and Council action is required to advance the project to detailed design and construction drawings.

Environmental Clearance

In accordance with the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), an Initial Study prepared for the new Community Center project indicates there is no substantial evidence of significant impact on the environment if the project incorporates the mitigations identified in the Initial Study. On June 27, 2002, the Initial Study, Notice of Intent to Adopt a Mitigated Negative Declaration and Proposed Mitigated Declaration (Attachment J) were circulated for public review and filed with the City Clerk. The notice was also advertised in the *San Jose Post Record* and posted at the project site. The public review period closed on July 19 and the City did not receive any comments. A Mitigated Negative Declaration is recommended for this project. The CEQA documents are available for review in the Public Works Department.

Exterior Design Concept

At the July 22 study session, staff presented a refined exterior architectural design concept for the new Community Center, incorporating comments from prior meetings with the Design Review Committee, Council Ad-Hoc Committee and the Parks and Recreation Commission (see attached Council study session report). The Council stated the refined building profile and design along Rengstorff Avenue was an improvement. The revised building elevation maintains the large windows facing the park to take advantage of the views and softens the angular roofline on Rengstorff Avenue. The building architecture blends well with the park

setting, responds to site constraints and fits the budget for the project. Upon approval of the exterior design, the project architect will proceed with design development leading to construction drawings and documents.

Design Review Services

The project budget for the new Community Center includes \$330,000 for design review/construction management services. With design development moving forward, staff will be issuing a request for proposals (RFP) to contractor/construction management firms for design review services during the detailed design and document phase of the project. These services will include:

- Value engineering, cost estimating and cost control.
- Constructibility reviews of design details and documents.

Staff will review the proposals, interview qualified firms and return to the Council with a recommendation to enter into a contract in September or October. In addition to design review services, construction management services will be needed during the preconstruction and construction phases to plan, prepare for and manage project construction. Staff will develop the scope and secure the required services when the Council approves the project for construction.

AGENDA: August 6, 2002

PAGE: 7

PUBLIC NOTICING—Agenda posting.

Prepared by:

Approved by:

Joan Jenkins
Transportation and Policy Manager

Tim Ko
Assistant Public Works Director

J. Michael Sartor
Capital Program Manager

Cathy R. Lazarus
Public Works Director

Kevin C. Duggan
City Manager

JJ/JMS/9/CAM
907-08-06-02M-E^

Attachments: A. Recommendations
B. July 22, 2002 Study Session Report
C. Comparison of Interim Senior Center Options
D. Building Picture/Location
E. Community Services Department Memorandum of July 25, 2002
F. Senior Comments from July 30, 2002 Briefing
G. Master Plan Option A
H. Master Plan Option B
I. Master Plan Option C
J. Negative Declaration

cc: Ms. Lisa Hendrickson, Avenidas

Ms. Margo Dutton, PACCC

Mr. Tom Myers, CSA

BSA Architects

APWD—Ko, CPM, SPM—Fallah, RM, RS—Petersen, SP—von Borck,
SCE—Muench, RPM, F/c